

**LANDMARK PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

APRIL 23, 1996

Council Liaison: Gina Janett

Staff Liaison: Joe Frank

Commission Chairperson: Jennifer Carpenter (225-0960)

SUMMARY OF MEETING: The following properties were designated as Local Landmarks: Marion Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover House, 1320 Oak Street, McGannon-Middleswart House, 300 East Elizabeth, Hiram Pierce House, 510 South Howes, John M. Riddle House, 530 Smith Street, A.A. Edwards House, 402 West Mountain, Welscher House 1304 South College Avenue, William C. Stover House, 503 Remington Street, and St. Joseph's Catholic School, the original portion dated 1925, at 127 North Howes. The Harmony Mill was voted to receive the Friend of Preservation Award. There was discussion of the improper installation of the canvas awning at the Police Substation at #11 Miller Block. The Local Landmark Designation for the Aggie Theater at 204 South College was denied. The LPC decided which projects would be awarded for the Rehabilitation Grant Program.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL: Commission Chairperson, Jennifer Carpenter, called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., 281 North College Avenue. Nicole Sneider, Secretary called the roll. Commission members Ruth Weatherford, Per Hogestad, Jean Kullman, Terence Hoaglund, James Tanner, and Bud Frick were present. Carol Tunner, Joe Frank, and Karen McWilliams represented staff.

GUESTS: Myrne Dunn; Jennifer Kathol and Bruce Biggi, 1320 West Oak; Karen Canino, St. Joseph's School; Mark Johnson, 508 West Olive; Jeff Benjamin, 824 Remington; Ann Wilmsen; Jane Abbott, 1501 West Mountain Avenue; Mitch Busted, 229 Jefferson Street; Helen Woodard, 308 East Myrtle; Carolyn Goodwin, 314 East Mulberry; and Norm Burnette, 503 Remington, attended the meeting.

AGENDA REVIEW: None.

STAFF REPORT: Ms. Tunner recommended that the Friend of Preservation Award be granted for the Harmony Mill project.

Ms. Weatherford moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission nominate the Harmony Mill for a Friend of Preservation Award. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hogestad, which passed unanimously. (6-0)

Ms. Tunner informed the Commission that there was a violation of the conditions to be met at the Police Substation, #11 Miller Block. Peterson Canvas and Awning had drilled

directly into the sandstone while installing the awning. The approved plans were clearly marked to illustrate the installation of the awning at the mortar joints of the stones. The Commission discussed some concerns they had about the situation. The rods of the frame of the awning are apparently wider than the mortar joints. If the frame was removed the existing holes would have to be plugged and would remain very visible, and to create more holes would only cause further damage to the stone. Ms. Carpenter also questioned if the sign shape was approved. Mr. Frank said that they had to curve the top and make it a little smaller because they could not use a sandwich board sign.

Jean Kullman arrived, 5:35 p.m.

Ms. Tunner outlined upcoming events for Preservation Week 1996. At City Council meeting, May 7, 1996 there will be a Preservation Week proclamation and the recipients of the Friend of Preservation Award will be honored. The Design Assistance Program will also go to Council. Brass plaques will be presented to four commercial properties. The walking tour will also be organized for June. The cost of the tour will be two dollars, which will go to benefit the Coy-Hoffman Barn project.

COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS: Ms. Carpenter said that the Historic Fort Collins Development Corporation received a mini-grant from the State to conduct a Community Initiated Development Workshop. The workshop, scheduled for fall, will focus on the Northern Hotel and will apply preservation and development principles to do a case study on the site.

Ms. Carpenter also addressed the increase in local landmark designations. She requested to have a work session sometime in June to discuss ways to manage the increased work load and streamline the process. Mr. Frank added that the HRPP contains a number of recommendations for streamlining.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The February 13, 1996 minutes were accepted as submitted.

CURRENT DESIGN REVIEW:

328 West Mountain Avenue, Avery House - Exterior Landscape Lighting

Susanne Stephens, President of Poudre Landmark Foundation attended the meeting. Ms. Tunner explained that they would like to light up the Avery House at night in order to dissuade vandalism and to highlight the property in the evening. Ms. Stephens said that the new pipe for the lighting system would follow the old pipe lines. Piping already exists from the planting room and a hole already exists in the screen. The pipe will be painted a stone color to match the house and a shrub exists to obscure the conduit as well. She stressed that it is a very dark corner and the historic building should be illuminated. In support of her request, she told the Commission that the gardener had found some one sleeping in the shrubs. She explained that they would like to wash light up against the

building where there is a recessed wall or a feature which stands out. Mr. Frick asked if there was light being installed on the north side of the building. Ms. Stephens explained that there is a street light on that side, but additional lighting could be added. The Carriage House on the north side also has illuminated front and back steps. That light is set on a timer and goes on from dusk till dawn. Mr. Frick suggested to add more lighting to the Carriage House as well.

Mr. Frick moved to approve the lighting plan for the Avery House, 328 West Mountain Avenue, as submitted with the option to include the gazebo, the Carriage House, and the north side of the main house and that the conduit to the main house be connected in the least obtrusive way as possible. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

314 East Mulberry, Replogle/Bennett House - State Tax Credit for Roof Replacement and Porch Repairs

Carolyn Goodwin, 314 East Mulberry Street was present. She passed out a summary of the work to be done, with a list of specific materials and procedures. Three layers of roofing on the original historic house will have to be removed in order to install the new roofing. She plans to use an architectural shingle, made of modified asphalt in the color weatherwood. The felt that will be used is manufactured by Tanko. Ms. Goodwin brought in a sample of the roofing material for the LPC to inspect. The porch roof will need new plywood decking and then a rubber compound sealer. Historically, the porch roof has been flat which has allowed moisture to collect. She would also like to add a gutter system around the main roof of the house in order to help drain water away from the flat porch roof. Mr. Frick and Mr. Hogestad discussed the shadow line of the shingles. The heavier the shingles which are used, the more they resemble wood shingles.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve Carolyn Goodwin's application for roof replacement and porch repair at 314 East Mulberry. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

525 Smith Street, George Coffin House - Addition of Exterior Balcony

David Wilkins, 525 Smith Street attended the meeting. He will acquire an iron balcony from a building that had been torn down in Denver. Ms. Tunner provided a picture of a similar house on Park Street with an added iron balcony and then showed a picture of the George Coffin House. She explained that the house is a simple farmhouse dated back to the 1880s. The addition of an iron balcony is not in the style of the house and an historic window will be removed. She discussed that it is important to protect an historic landmark but it is also very important that people be able to make changes to their property which make it livable and comfortable for them. The porch on the back of the house is only visible from the rear alley. Any addition to the house in the future would be in the rear and

would cause the historic window to be removed in any case. Mr. Wilkins said that he was committed to keeping the visible appearance of the house from the front even through retrofitting. He needs more leverage in back, especially in the master bedroom. To add more room to the bedroom, instead of building an addition they would like to install double French doors which enter out on to the iron balcony. It would make the bedroom more open while utilizing a period piece. Ms. Weatherford asked what will be done with the historic window which will be removed. Mr. Wilkins said that many windows need to be replaced, so the window can be used somewhere else in the house.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve David Wilkin's request for the addition of an iron balcony at his home at 525 Smith Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Designations

- * Marion Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover House, 1320 West Oak - Jennifer Kathol and Bruce Biggi, owners**

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report and slides. Ms. Kathol and Mr. Biggi were present for the meeting. The local landmark designation of this property is based upon its Tudor Revival architectural style. Frank P. Stover lived in the house for three years prior to his death. A Minneapolis architect, Marion Alice Parker designed the house in 1922. The summer house was constructed in 1937 but was not included in the application.

Mr. Hoaglund moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Local Landmark Designation of the Alice Parker/Frank P. Stover House at 1320 West Oak. The motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

- * McGannon-Middleswart House and Garage, 300 East Elizabeth - Jane Welzel, owner**

This house is architecturally significant for it's Queen Anne style. The garage also contributes to the architectural style. In 1980, a new fireplace was added which mimics the style of the house. An addition is planned for the back.

Mr. Hoaglund moved that the Landmark Preservation Commission approve the Local Landmark Designation of the McGannon-Middleswart House and Garage, 300 East Elizabeth. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

- * Hiram Pierce House, 510 South Howes Street - Douglas and Winifred Wood,**

owners

Ms. McWilliams presented the Hiram Pierce House, which exemplifies the American Foursquare style of architecture. This style was popular in Fort Collins from 1900 - 1930. Hiram Pierce, an early Fort Collins contractor and builder, built the house in 1903. This house is significant for its architectural and historical importance. Non-original concrete walls have been added to the porch.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the Hiram Pierce House, 510 South Howes Street for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

* **John M. Riddle House, 530 Smith Street - Robert and Maureen Hoffert, trustees**

Ms. McWilliams presented the staff report for this vernacular Queen Anne. The John M. Riddle house was constructed in 1903 and was designed by Montezuma W. Fuller. The wrap around porch in the rear of the property was extended and enclosed in 1954. The garage is not considered historic. Mr. Bridges stated that this house is almost identical to the house at 314 East Mulberry, which was built in 1902. The house is significant for its architecture.

Mr. Hoaglund moved to approve the John M. Riddle House, 530 Smith Street for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

* **A.A. Edwards House, 402 West Mountain Avenue - Greg Belcher, owner**

Ms. McWilliams presented this building which was constructed by Montezuma Fuller in 1904. It was designed in the Foursquare architectural style with Neoclassical details. A.A. Edwards was the founder of the Water Supply and Storage Company. This property is significant for both its architectural style and historical association.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the A.A. Edwards House, 402 West Mountain Avenue for Local Landmark Designation. This motion was seconded by Mr. Frick, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

* **Welscher House, 1304 South College - Robert Sibelrud, owner**

Ms. McWilliams presented this property which demonstrates the Mediterranean style of architecture. The house was built in 1924 by Montezuma Fuller. The original attached garage has been converted into office space. A picture was presented circa 1925. This property is significant for its architectural style.

Mr. Hoaglund moved to approve the Welscher House, 1304 South College Avenue for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Weatherford, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

*** William C. Stover House, 503 Remington Street - Donald and Sharon Johnson and Norman and Linda Burnette, owners**

Norman Burnette was present for the meeting. William C. Stover, the brother of Frank Stover, was a highly respected Fort Collins pioneer and business leader. He was one of the founders of what is currently Norwest Bank. The house demonstrates the Italianate style of architecture. Mr. Hoaglund asked if the porch was original because it seemed lower than the roof line. Ms. McWilliams explained that the Sanborn drawings illustrated a slightly different outline for the porch. She added that the building had been renovated for office space and was built by Hiram Pierce. Ms. Tunner thought that the double gallery exemplified a Southern style of architecture. The building is significant for both its architectural style and for its historical association.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the William C. Stover House, 503 Remington Street for Local Landmark Designation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoaglund, which passed unanimously. (7-0)

*** Original 1925 section of the St. Joseph's Catholic School, 127 North Howes Street - Karen Canino for Pastor Phillip S. Meredith**

Karen Canino was present for the meeting. A map depicting the 1925 portion of the building was provided. A question arose at the last LPC meeting as to what portions of the building should be designated and how this designation might affect the applicant when applying for future grants. Staff was able to compare the designation of this property to the Fort Collins High School because there were many similarities between the two designations. The LPC discussed setting precedents by designating an original building without designating its attached additions.

Ms. Weatherford moved to approve the original 1925 section of the St. Joseph's Catholic School, 127 North Howes Street for Local Landmark Designation. Mr. Frick seconded the motion which passed unanimously. (7-0)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Designations

*** Aggie Theater, 204 South College - Cooper Stetson and John O'Leary**

Ms. McWilliams presented a revised staff report at the meeting. She directed the LPC to

the first paragraph of the report which explained the historical significance of the building. "The Aggie Theater provided motion picture entertainment to the City of Fort Collins for more than forty years from 1953 until 1995. The building which housed the Aggie has been an integral part of the central business district of Fort Collins since its construction. Additionally, the building is historically significant at the local level for the longevity and apparent success of the Waner-Inglesfield and Harris-Warner furniture businesses; they were fixtures of downtown Fort Collins for nearly twenty years in the early to mid-twentieth century." Ms. McWilliams explained the history of the building. The building was a furniture store from 1916 until a devastating fire in 1951. The fire gutted the interior, but left the shell of the building. In 1952 when the renovation of the building took place, converting it into a movie theater, the third level of the building was removed. The building's facade was renovated into a theater and marquee. Ms. McWilliams showed current slides of the front and rear of the building and told the Commission that staff's recommendation was to designate the Aggie Theater as a Local Landmark, based upon the original construction date of 1916.

Mr. Tanner had a question about the front facade of the building. He thought that the facade did not look as though it was dated from the 1940's. Ms. McWilliams explained that some of the exterior brick which is visible on the first and second level is believed to be the original 1916 brick work. She stated that the marquee had been added and the entry way had been recessed with an added ticket booth and two side display boards with lights for posters. Most of the changes have taken place on the first floor as well as the installation of the marquee. The brick on the second floor is believed to be original as well as any visible brick on the ground floor. Mr. Hoaglund asked if there was very little ornamentation on the building. His observation was affirmed by Ms. McWilliams and she added that there may have been more detail on the third floor which was knocked down. Mr. Tanner asked if the windows on the second floor were original. Ms. McWilliams said that the window openings appear to be original but she does not believe that the glazing is original. Mr. Tanner asked if the dimensions and the location of the windows were original. Mr. Hoaglund agreed that the size and location of windows did not look to be in the style of the architecture of that time period for that type of building.

Mr. Tanner asked what type of documentation is available to see what this building looked like from the 1920's to the 1950's. Ms. McWilliams said that there is very little documentation of any kind on this building. After comparing the sides of the building and the way they were built to the front of the building and the way it exists today, Mr. Tanner does not believe that this building has an historic facade and strongly questioned whether it could be considered the original facade. He also questioned what the LPC is trying to preserve. Mr. Frick questioned if they wanted to preserve the front facade of the theater or the front of the 1916 building. Mr. Tanner then asked what the owners are going to restore it to. Ms. McWilliams told the Commission that the owners are going to restore it to a movie theater facade. Ms. Carpenter said that the movie theater facade was not historic. Ms. McWilliams had the plans to show the LPC what the owners want to do to the building. Mr. Tanner said that he was interested in what it used to be, what it was before

the fifties, and not after. He feels that they don't have enough information about the building from that time period. Ms. McWilliams said that the building was substantially renovated around 1952-1953. Mr. Frick said that what now exists is the 1952-1953 facade and then the side walls and back wall are the original building. The front of the building is not the original building. Mr. Hogestad felt that only two-thirds of the original building exists. Ms. Carpenter expressed that this designation is difficult because it is the Aggie Theater, which has great sentimental value to everyone and the LPC is very excited that it is going to remain there and exist as an entertainment center. Whether the building is historic or not at this point is the remaining question. Ms. McWilliams said that the existing facade is forty-three years old. Mr. Tanner felt that it is his view there just wasn't enough of the building left to justify designating it as an historic landmark. Ms. Carpenter remembered when the Commission had been faced with this decision before. In that case it was the Children's Mercantile and the building was being reconstructed back to exactly what the building looked like, based on adequate photo documentation.

Mr. Frick asked if the Commission felt that they should look at what the owners are planning to do to the Aggie Theater. Ms. Carpenter explained that they already have seen the plans and basically they will be restoring the current theater facade. It is not going back to the original building. Ms. Weatherford asked for staff's recommendation on this issue following the discussion. Ms. McWilliams responded, in light of the issues that the LPC had pointed out, she felt that the facade of the current structure was only forty-three years old and that she would have to change her recommendation, to denial of the application for local landmark designation. She said that she changed her recommendation because that facade which exists was only forty-three years old. Mr. Frick asked what was the intention of the designation in the first place. Ms. McWilliams said that it was to designate a perceived historic landmark in Fort Collins and as Ms. Carpenter pointed out there is a tremendous sentimental value associated with this building. Ms. McWilliams said, since so much of the original building still stood, staff thought there would be the potential for it to be considered an historic landmark. Mr. Hoaglund said that the Aggie Theater itself, as a theater, is only forty-three years old. Mr. Frick said that the building could always be reversed and taken back to what ever was perceived as the original three story or two story building. Mr. Hogestad responded, to reconstruct the building back to its original state would be a real stretch. Ms. Carpenter then reminded the Commission that they don't have any real photo-documentation. Ms. McWilliams also added that a building should never be designated according to what may happen, it is supposed to be designated for what exists at the time of designation.

Carolyn Goodwin offered public input, explaining that she attended the Aggie Theater while she was in high school in Fort Collins and agreed it was a great source for entertainment and commercial activity in the area. But she agreed there is more of an emotional attachment to the building because of its use and sees no real historic value in it. Ms. Tunner said that the building as a theater is an adaptive reuse. Ms. McWilliams said that the marquee, the display for upcoming events and the entrance will remain there. The exterior theater architecture will exist but the interior will be changed. The

Commission agreed that at this point the building does not meet the criteria for local landmark designation.

Mr. Hoaglund moved to deny the Local Landmark Designation for the Aggie Theater building at 204 South College. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tanner which passed unanimously. (Yeas:7 and Nays:0)

Landmark Rehabilitation Grant Programs - Final Selection of Grant Awards

Leanne Lawrie, City Planner presented the Commission with packets containing the ranking of rehabilitation grant applications. She explained that #24, 226 West Laurel, Street had been pulled from the process and #1, Aggie Theater was not designated so it was no longer eligible. Funding of \$40,781 to be awarded. She explained that the program is not guaranteed to receive another \$20,000 for next year so all of the funds do not have to be awarded in this round. Projects which have received funding in prior years were ranked lower than new applications as per the ordinance. The same ranking sheets were used last year and the system may be considered arbitrary. Mr. Frick declared a conflict of interest while discussing application #2 for 212 - 218 Walnut Street and abstained from the conversation.

Ms. Carpenter requested that the LPC discuss the criteria identified on the ranking sheets. Some other ideas, concerns, and questions were discussed as follows:

1. Projects could be partially funded.
2. Is the application based on need or hardship?
3. Can votes be tabled as they go through the process?
4. Funds should be spread through commercial and residential projects.
5. The applications should be reviewed from the bottom to the top to see if anything should be pulled up in rank for significant reasons.

It was identified that 518 Peterson and Canino's restaurant received funding in the past. There was discussion among the LPC concerning the definition of preservation necessity. To determine preservation necessity it was asked how much of the building had been altered, as well as existing plans and policies. Other issues related to preservation necessity included neglect of the property, adverse physical conditions, if there was a threat to the existence of the building, or any other conditions or threats which are specific or particular to that site or building. The LPC also discussed whether repairs were real maintenance problems or a result of some threat or serious damage to the building. For example, at 229 Jefferson Street, #24, a leak has softened the brick and is now causing structural damage. Mitch Busted, owner, explained that he feels that his building is threatened because of the extent of the water damage. When he bought the building there had been no gutter system. He explained that there are so few residential buildings left along Jefferson Street, and many of the people who live there have lower incomes and can not afford renovation so it is a hardship. Mr. Tanner wanted to remind the Commission

that restoration and rehabilitation is not just fixing something that has worn down.

Ms. Lawrie read from the ordinance which explained the goals of the program. It stated that the Landmark Rehabilitation Grant shall be awarded as long as the LPC first determines that the applicant has demonstrated effort to bring the property back to its original appearance, that the structure proposed to be rehabilitated will be preserved and will maintain its historic integrity for future generations, and the amount of funding to be used on exterior rehabilitation is reasonable under the circumstances.

The LPC discussed voting on projects as they were reviewed but felt it would be more objective and logical to establish three categories addressing the preservation necessity and urgency of each rehabilitation effort. The established headings were Low, Medium, and High. Projects rated High would be considered a preservation priority. They were also willing to fund projects partially or with a contingency.

Ms. Carpenter expressed that the ranking sheet did not seem to work to meet the goals of the program. She suggested that the ranking sheet be redesigned in the future. The Commission was also unsure of how to define a threat and wanted that description taken off the ranking sheet in the future. They also discussed that preservation necessity could not be related to or defined for every property. Ms. Tunner explained that there is a difference in cost when stabilizing a building versus taking the structure back to an historic state. There is also a difference in taking a building back to its original state and some historic state.

At this point, the LPC discussed whether the projects fell into the Low, Medium, or High category. Mr. Hogstad explained that projects which were considered to be more than maintenance received a higher funding priority. Ms. Carpenter stated that the terms used on the ranking sheets were difficult to use and discussed the difference between restoration and rehabilitation. Ms. Weatherford discussed awarding an even percentage across the board to partially funded projects. It was difficult for the Commission to find a system to award funding based on pieces of a proposed rehabilitation project. The LPC also discussed that commercial properties may inherently be awarded more funding because they have larger projects and more matching funds. Ms. Weatherford also felt that they should be looking at the validity of the current application and not whether the applicant had been awarded funding last year. The Commission responded that these projects should still be considered a low to medium priority for funding. Mr. Tanner explained that ranking the projects into the categories of High, Medium, or Low seemed arbitrary and he could not define clearly what the criteria meant on the ranking sheets. He suggested to create a more defined ranking sheet which included more information on the buildings.

Mr. Bridges suggested giving people options along with direction while informing them of what will not be funded. Then let them choose their priorities which the LPC would support. He felt that the program needed to be supportive and rewarding in order to work

for the applicants.

Public input came from Ann Wilsen, #18 One West Art Center. She put in a plea for partial funding for removal of an awning. She explained that this year they plan to do more exterior work on the building to restore the side of the Old Post Office. Removal of the awning will leave holes in the building which will need repair. She did not have an accurate estimate for the proposed work.

Jeff Benjamin, 229 Jefferson Street, #23, was also willing to accept partial funding for the project because he would really like to do the work.

Norm Brunette, 503 Remington expressed his appreciation for the program.

Jeff Bridges, resident of Fort Collins requested that the LPC find a way to partially fund projects and keep people involved in the rehabilitation process so that they will be back with more proposed projects.

Mark Johnson, 508 West Olive felt his proposed project would bring back the feel of the house.

After reviewing the options presented in each of the proposals and analyzing how each rehabilitation project would affect the preservation and historic integrity of the property, the Commission voted on what rehabilitation efforts would be funded.

_____ moved to _____. The motion was seconded by _____. The motion passed unanimously. (7-0).

OTHER BUSINESS: None.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Submitted by Nicole Sneider, Secretary.

Project Location	Applicant	Amount Funded	Matching Funds
212-218 Walnut	John Arnolfo (Silver Grill)	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 16,250.00
308 E. Myrtle	Helen Woodard	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 8,810.00
700 Remington Street	Coleen Conway	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 13,405.00
314 E. Mulberry	Carolyn Goodwin	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 10,000.00
510 South Howes	Douglas S. Wood and Winifred L. Wood	\$ 1,880.00	\$ 3,380.00
1304 S. College	Robert L. Siberlud	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 9,000.00
530 Smith Street	Bob and Maureen Hoffert	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 8,520.00
145 North Loomis	John Morley	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 3,300.00
503 Remington	Norm and Linda Burnette & Don and Sharon Johnson	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 9,445.00
824 Remington St.	Jeff Benjamin	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 2,400.00
1320 W. Oak	Jennifer Kathol and Bruce Biggi	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 6,900.00
127 North Howes	Saint Joseph's	\$ 4,895.00	\$ 4,895.00
300 East Elizabeth	Jane Weizel	\$ 450.00	\$ 1,350.00
229 Jefferson	Mitch Busted and Marilyn Roberts	\$ 1,918.00	\$ 3,676.00
1501 W. Mountain Ave.	Jane Abbott	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 3,240.00
TOTALS		\$ 41,043.00	\$ 104,571.00
	Matching funding to grant award is \$2.55		